

REMARKS

Claim status

Claims 1-16 were pending in the application at the time of the current Office Action. All stand rejected as being obvious over prior art. Claims 1 and 3 are amended herein solely for the purpose of clarifying the form of the claim. Claims 1-16 are currently pending in the application.

Section 102 rejections

There are no present rejections under Section 102.

Section 103 rejections

In the current Office action, claims 1-5, 10-14, 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Grewe et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,625,673), hereafter referred to as "Grewe '673", in view of Jones, Jr. (U.S. Patent No. 5,974,334), hereafter referred to as "Jones '334".

In the current Office action, claims 6-9, 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Grewe '673 in view of Jones '334 and still further in view of Pardo (U.S. Patent No. 6,266,539) hereafter referred to as "Pardo '539".

Applicants respectfully traverse the foregoing rejections in view of the above pending claims and for reasons set forth hereafter.

Independent claim 1 recites a portable computing, communication and entertainment device comprising a detachable handset unit sized for handheld grasping. The detachable handset unit includes a processor and a plurality of first circuits such that the processor controls the operation of the first circuits. The device also comprises a portable docking display unit dimensioned to receive docking of the detachable handset unit. The portable docking display unit includes a first display and a plurality of second circuits. When the detachable handset unit is docked to the portable docking display unit, the processor of the detachable handset unit not only controls the first circuits of the detachable handset unit but also controls the operation of at least one of the second circuits and the first display of the portable docking display unit. In the claimed invention, the portable docking display unit can be a "dummy" unit that cannot operate

unless the detachable handset unit is docked to the portable docking display unit. The purpose of docking the detachable handset unit to the portable docking display unit is to extend the capability of the detachable handset unit to function more like a portable laptop computer, for example.

It is respectfully submitted that neither Grewe '673 nor Jones '334, nor the combination of the two teach or suggest the claimed invention. Specifically, Grewe '673 and Jones '334 do not teach or suggest a detachable handset unit, having a processor, to control the operation of not only circuits within the detachable handset unit, but also to control the operation of at least one of a display of the portable docking display unit and circuits of the portable docking display unit when the handset unit is docked to the docking display unit, as does the claimed invention.

Instead, Grewe '673 describes interconnecting a PDA with some other accessory to enhance the PDA. (Abstract) For example, Grewe '673 describes mating a cellular telephone to a PDA simply to provide communication between the cellular telephone and the PDA. (Fig. 1 and Fig. 2) The cellular telephone has its own processing capability and can be operated independently of the PDA. Likewise, the PDA has its own processing capability and can be operated independently of the cellular telephone. (column 1, lines 57-64) Grewe '673 does not teach or suggest, for example, using a processor of the cellular telephone to control operation of any circuitry or display of the PDA. In the claimed invention, the processor of the handset unit is used to control the operation of at least one of a display of the portable docking display unit and circuits of the portable docking display unit. The claimed invention does not require a processor in the portable docking display unit as does each of the PDA and cellular telephone of Grewe '673. In the claimed invention, when the handset unit is docked to the portable docking display unit, the processor of the handset unit provides processing capability for the docking display unit. Similarly, none of the other embodiments described in Grewe '673 teach or suggest using a processor of a hand-held device to control parts of another device having a display, when docked.

Jones '334 describes a PDA having a multi-positional handset. The PDA has a base with a recessed handset cradle and a handset with a shape complementary to the configuration of the cradle. (column 3, lines 8-19) The handset docks to the PDA base simply to provide power to the handset (i.e., to charge a battery of the handset). (column 4, lines 11-30) Jones '334 does not

teach or suggest using a processor of the handset to control the operation of any part of the PDA or vice versa. Jones '334 simply describes docking the handset to the PDA base in a flush configuration for mobile use, and in a non-flush configuration for office use.

In view of at least the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 1 defines allowable subject matter. Since claims 2-15 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that dependent claims 2-15 define allowable subject matter as well.

Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner taking Official Notice that GPS is very well known in the art for monitoring the position of an object such that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include GPS in a handset that is capable of docking to and controlling the operation of a portable docking display unit. Applicant has argued above that the device of claim 1 is not obvious. Therefore, the device of claim 1 with GPS is not obvious. Since claim 16 depends indirectly from claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that dependent claim 16 defines allowable subject matter.

Accordingly, the applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejections based on the arguments made above. After such reconsideration, it is urged that allowance of all claims will be in order.

Respectfully submitted,
Hahn Loeser + Parks, LLP

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'S. Oldham', with a stylized, flowing script.

Scott M. Oldham
Registration No. 32,712
Attorney for Applicant

Twin Oaks Estate
1225 West Market Street
Akron, OH 44313-7188
(330) 864-5550
Fax 330-864-7986
smoldham@hahnlaw.com